The central focus of her analysis is on interpretation of the material nature of the sources used. The author uses the term “phantom” to describe this multilayered (non-)presence of Czech Germans at the time.

"AGAINST THE GERMANS AND THEIR SPAS".
LUHAČOVICE IN THE DISCOURSE OF THE CZECH NATIONAL MOVEMENT
Katrin Nagovnack

In 1901, a Czech stock company bought the Moravian spa resort, Luhačovice. The Czech press keenly reported on the subsequent changes applied to the architectural design of the resort and frequently labelled it a “national spa” using images and arguments widely known since the national movement had emerged. The press constructed an antagonistic relationship between Luhačovice and the Bohemian spa triangle, which was regarded as “German”. It praised the Moravian town not only as a retreat for ethnic Czech people, but also as a meeting place for artists and as more conducive to one’s health, quieter and more affordable than Karlsbad and Marienbad. The press coverage is an outstanding example of a nationalistic way of discourse. This approach is analyzed by the author using Beatrice Dernbach’s agenda model and also the concept of “imagined territories”. Everyday life in Luhačovice however, with its almost complete lack of tensions between Czechs and Germans, was not well reflected in the scenarios drawn up by the press.

NATIONAL CLASSIFICATION POLITICS IN STATE CENSUSES. THE BOHEMIAN LANDS 1880-1930
Pawel Kladiwa

The study opens with a methodological examination of concepts of nationality and ethnicity and goes on to compare national classification in the Bohemian Lands under two different political and ideological systems – the Habsburg monarchy (1867-1918) and the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918-1938). The author focuses on how those two regimes sought to determine the ethnic composition of their territory, whereby he seeks to answer the following questions: What does it mean when a census defines nationality by means of “language of daily use”? What were the advantages and the limits of determining, in the Habsburg monarchy, nationality in this way, and, on the other hand, of directly asking a person’s nationality, as in the First Republic? Why did the Habsburg authorities elect to collect data for language of daily use, not family language or directly nationality as perceived by each respondent? Did this correspond to the rationale of a supranational state? On the other hand, what caused Czechoslovak state organs to ask respondents for their ‘national-
ity’, and what means were tried to ensure the best possible returns for Czechoslovak nationality? How did Czech nationalists and politicians react to categorization according to language of daily use in the Habsburg monarchy and, in contrast, ethnic German activists and politicians to directly registering nationality in the First Republic?

“BY ROYAL BOHEMIAN POWER AND PERFECTION”. Changes in Noble Titles in the Context of Ennoblements both in the Bohemian Kingdom and under Habsburg Rule

Jiří Brňovják

The present study furnishes a comprehensive insight into the development of noble titles in Bohemia in the period from the accession to the throne of Ferdinand I. (1526) through to the proclamation of the Austrian Empire (1804). The right to bestow a noble title upon somebody was a royal prerogative, admission to the noble corporations, however, was decided upon by the estates themselves. This kind of cooperation between king and estates was terminated in the 1620s as a consequence of the the estate rebellion having been defeated. The competences that had belonged to the estates were transferred in their entirety to the King of Bohemia. At the same time, a graduated set of noble titles modeled after the fashion of the Reich was introduced, which broadly corresponded to the one in use in the Austrian territories. A turning point in the legal and territorial definition of Bohemian noble titles was the substitution, in 1752, of a unified list of noble titles valid throughout the Austrian Hereditary Lands for the previously independent sets of Bohemian and Austrian titles. However, the legal competence of awarding noble titles in the Hereditary Lands remained with the offices of King of Bohemia and Archduke of Austria, respectively. This allowed, in a few individual cases in the second half of the 18th century, the titles of prince or duke to be awarded to Bohemian subjects. The legal dichotomy was not abolished until 1810 when a decree transferred all competences connected to the awarding of noble titles to the Austrian Emperor. Since then, the term ‘Austrian Imperial nobility’ has been finally justified.